A Word of Self-Defence.

READ BY THE RECTOR, AT A FULL MEETING OF THE

WARDENS AND VESTRYMEN OF ST. MICHAEL'S CHURCH,

TRENTON, NEW JERSEY,

AND PUBLISHED WITH THEIR UNANIMOUS APPROVAL,

SEPTEMBER 1850.

For some years past I have been extensively represented as a troublesome and factious presbyter of the Church in New Jersey. The terms *radical*, *agitator*, *low-churchman*, *opposer of the Bishop*, have been reproachfully applied to me. It has ever seemed to those who have thus applied them, a needless labour to define the grounds of accusation. It has proved a much easier thing to utter a flippant denunciation; and this has been found much more efficacious for sustaining certain views and extending certain influences, peculiar to our diocese; views that cannot bear much light, and that suffer very essentially when subjected to the ordeal of a fair investigation. For some persons have seemed to understand that if suspicion can once be well awakened against a man's *motives*, there is little influence to be apprehended from his opinions, however those opinions may be fortified by argument, or however conclusively drawn from the pure fountains of truth. These vague and groundless charges have been carried from our own diocese to other sections of the Church. I have very frequently heard of them when meeting clerical friends, the fellow-students and associates of earlier days. But in no case have I discovered any distrust in consequence against either my personal or professional character—the harmony of my pastoral relations has been in no wise disturbed—I have found no abatement of confidence on the part of any amongst whom are found all the chief duties and social engagements of life. Hence I have never written a line, nor given myself the slightest trouble to remove the aspersions thrown upon my name, for I have all along felt that I could perfectly well afford to be silent, and in the consciousness of my position have been content to let the subject pass without a word even of open remonstrance.

But within the last year or two, new points of issue have arisen. The graver topics brought openly and reproachfully before us are such as involve the *personal reputation and moral character of our Bishop*. They are questions, compared with which all previous disagreements in matters of Church polity and Episcopal prerogative are unimportant; for they are associated most intimately and unavoidably with every thing dear to us in the reputation, the influence, and extension of the Church. For a long time there was no one found to resist these charges more decidedly and cordially than myself. But for a few months past they have appeared to be of such a nature—so openly made, and by men holding positions of weight and influence in the community, and so widely disseminated, both in and out of the Church, that here we have been unable to resist their force, and, as Churchmen, have felt ourselves in consequence oppressed with a load far heavier than we can justly be expected to bear. They have come up before us from sources and in forms altogether too serious to be set down to the account of that idle gossip which can well be left to work out its own exhaustion. Hence I have insisted that these public charges ought to be subjected to an investigation; that the truth ought to be brought out, and that, if innocent of the things imputed to him, the Bishop owes it to himself and the Church to see that his accusers be made to answer for their libellous language before a civil tribunal. I have met but two gentlemen (save those intimately connected with the Bishop's affairs) who entertain an opinion on this point adverse to my own.

For thus much of freedom in thinking and speaking I have been violently assailed—more violently than others, no doubt, because I am located in the capital of the state, where I am in the way of hearing and speaking more than most others, and because I am guilty of the crime of speaking out what I know and feel. I have in no sense been *the accuser* of Bishop Doane. I have only spoken, as every where I hear others speak, as the humblest member of the Church has a right to speak, and as I humbly think every *minister* of the Church *ought* to speak. I have not been able to ascertain one specific thing that has with any truth, or any plausible show of truth even, been charged against me. But for the heresy of repeating what is publicly alleged of the Bishop, not by way of judging him, but for claiming that an investigation ought to be demanded, I am bitterly traduced. I do not say that there is a united and systematic effort in certain quarters to destroy, if possible, my profes-

sional character; but I do say that unjust and untrue representations of my motives and conduct have been set forth by different individuals who are, or who are supposed to be, identified in feeling and operation with important questions and interests in the diocese. In March last, I received a letter from a lawyer who had just been made Prosecutor of Burlington County, not by way of inquiry, but directly charging me with language in reference to a case presented before the grand jury—language that I had never used, or at the time heard of, and pronouncing it libellous and false. There was no point or visible object in the letter, save as it manifested a very chivalrous attempt to intimidate and close the mouth of a defenceless clergyman. After waiting ten days in vain to have it withdrawn, I returned it, telling the man that if he had any thing further to communicate, he must make his communication in a respectful manner, in order to gain for it any attention. I have heard nothing from him since. A report of the same transaction reached some of the upper parishes of the diocese. Another lawyer, who has had an official part in the affairs of Bishop Doane, was inquired of respecting it by a distinguished layman, recently of our diocese, but now filling a post of usefulness and honour in the city of New York, and it was pronounced to be all a *slander proceeding from me*, though all that I had said was in one of the newspapers of the town, and seemed to be in every body's mouth. At our late Convention, my name was bandied about from one to another, evidently for the sole purpose of heaping odium upon it. The day after its adjournment, a correspondence was opened upon me, reproving me as a slanderer, accompanied with a very significant warning and very amiably guarding me as to my language in the future. These letters, to the number of five, bearing as they do upon a very important transaction, will be found entire in the following pages.

Now, I have submitted to all this, and to a vast deal more of the same kind of unmerited denunciation, in silence. But there is a limit to forbearance, and that limit has been reached. "Patience" has had "her perfect work," and is entirely exhausted. I do not feel called upon to hold my peace for ever, and quietly be subjected to all manner of defamatory epithets, when I know the ground on which I stand and when I am abundantly able to sustain myself in all that I have uttered. There are many brethren, clerical and lay, (I believe a very large majority in the diocese) who share my views and feelings on the subject which presses so heavily on the Church; and there are others who with me share the abuse of which I have

now spoken. But they are able to show themselves their own defenders. In the vindication of myself I shall now introduce such matters only as have been presented unsought to my notice and such as have already a large measure of notoriety in the public mind. All are aware that in eliciting truth on subjects strictly ecclesiastical there is no power existing for compelling testimony. To volunteer it, is always regarded as a most unenviable thing. I have therefore asked no affidavit for sustaining any one of the many specific acts which "public rumour" visits upon Bishop Doane as dishonourable or dishonest. The more general and undeniable facts will for the present at least answer my purpose. To hold the sentiment and feeling which so extensively prevail, and which I for one have had the assurance to express will appear, I think, in conclusion to be at least a very pardonable weakness.

In the Convention of 1849, a preamble and resolution were offered in the following words:

Whereas, a Bishop should be blameless, and should have a good report of those that are without, lest he fall into reproach; and, whereas, public rumour, as well as newspaper publications, have made serious charges against our Bishop, impeaching his moral character, tending to impair his usefulness, and to bring the Church of which he is Bishop into disrepute—therefore,

Resolved, That a committee be appointed, consisting of three clergymen and three laymen, who, or a majority of whom, shall make such inquiries as shall satisfy them of the innocency of the accused, or of the sufficiency of ground for presentment and trial; and that they do make report to this Convention at its present session, or at such other time as this Convention shall designate.

Though the subject was thus moved by a lay deputy of my own parish I had no agency in the movement, nor was I consulted in regard to it. I was told by the mover that his course was determined on in consequence of the sad reports which had reached him after he had arrived in Burlington for attending the Convention, which reports he found were openly discussed and extensively believed. Though I considered the measure eminently just and proper in itself, I doubted the expediency of presenting it, for I did not believe that any truth in regard to it could be gained through the action of the Convention. When it was moved that the Convention go into a committee of the whole, as it was perfectly competent to do under its own rule of order, the motion was resisted. The Bishop showed an evident determination to keep the chair, though

it was understood that the night previous, he had consented to vacate it, when the anticipated resolution should be brought forward. The mover had to proceed, therefore, in the Bishop's presence. He declared himself actuated by the kindliest feelings toward the Bishop, and that he thought the resolution opened a convenient and most appropriate opportunity for him to acquit himself and the Church at the same time, of the wide spread reproach that had either justly or unjustly fallen upon both. A most earnest and violent opposition to the resolution was raised. The Bishop who had built up the Church, and such glorious institutions of learning within it, must not be suspected, was the line of declamatory appeal. If any thing were to be done, it was insisted that charges and specifications, and proofs should be brought forward—in fact, that the Convention then should do that which by the general Convention is deputed to the Episcopal Bench. With rather dubious taste for a Professor to manifest, the rumours were denominated the *filth of the gutters,* even though a man of unquestioned character for truth and veracity had a few days previous gone to Mount Holly for the avowed purpose of presenting the Bishop before the grand jury, and though a few days after, the same thing was threatened by a lawyer, who claimed to carry in his pocket all the documents essential to his success. I considered (and so expressed myself) that as the resolution had been brought forward it was essentially the property of the Bishop, that inasmuch as it chiefly concerned him I should vote as he should desire. But the declamation was before the Bishop, and all one side. There was no disposition *to force the question* to an issue opposite to that which the Bishop and the open opposers of the resolution had plainly predetermined; and although "no solitary Aye broke the awful silence!" there was in reality no unanimous rejection. A gentleman of eminence and character residing in Burlington, but not belonging to the Convention, declared to me that he heard no less than fifteen members say that the inquiry proposed ought to be instituted. The mover was afterward approached by a score at least, and said by them to be in the right. A trustee of the college, and one of the Bishop's most faithful friends, whose friendship to him and his institutions had been largely tested by his purse, remarked to me a short time subsequently that he had no doubt but that a large majority of the Convention were in mind thoroughly satisfied with the wisdom and propriety of the resolution.

The legal argument, as coming from a judge learned in questions

of law, was not a little singular. The ground taken was that we have no article of our constitution nor any canon providing for an inquiry into rumours affecting the character of our Bishop, and, *therefore*, any action of the Convention, under the resolution, would be *unconstitutional and uncanonical!* which is in substance to affirm that the Convention has no power to transact any business whatever, unless permission to do so be specially provided for by constitution or canon. We have a canon to meet the case of a minister of the Church "accused by public rumour" of any thing which under the canon of the general Convention subjects him to trial. The Bishop is instructed (or in case of vacancy in the Episcopate, the clerical members of the Standing Committee,) to appoint a committee to inquire into the truth or falsehood of the rumours. And if the committee shall decide that there is cause for proceeding, the same canon provides for the organization of a court. But in the lack of a similar canon respecting the Bishop, it was urged that the Convention had no power to act in the premises—a principle which followed out would render that body utterly powerless for action, even should the Bishop be notoriously guilty of violating every commandment of the decalogue. In a word, to act without express permission from constitution or canon was represented by the judge as equivalent to acting *against* the written law of the diocese—the one case like the other being *unconstitutional and uncanonical.*

The answer to all this simply was that the general Convention permits any diocesan Convention, for cause, to present its Bishop for trial, and such permission of very necessity permits the use of all such *preliminary measures* as may be deemed important for reaching the end. The canon of the general Convention does not prescribe the way and mode by which a Bishop may be brought to trial. It only provides the course of proceeding after he is presented. Therefore it was insisted that the Convention of New Jersey had full power to take any action in the case that might be deemed expedient, provided there were no violation of the constitution or canons of the diocese. But all would not do. The resolution was made to serve the appearance of the purpose hoped for, through its very rejection. It was sounded forth and echoed back from the other side of the Atlantic, that the Bishop of New Jersey had been arraigned on charges against his character, and triumphantly, aye, and *unanimously* acquitted by his Convention! All would have rejoiced if a triumphant vindication could have been

attempted and sustained. But some certainly were disposed to protest against *such a mode* as that adopted for bringing it about.

Within an hour after the resolution was thus disposed of, a question was raised and a development followed such as to satisfy members of the Convention of the justness and propriety of the resolution, even though the specified grounds of its presentment had been ever so insufficient. The well known pressure of the Bishop's pecuniary embarrassments had created a fear in the minds of many that the Episcopal Fund might, in consequence, be put in a position of insecurity. According to the requirement of the Constitution, the treasurer, the Rev. Mr. Germain, had presented his report, and according to usage a committee was appointed by the Bishop to examine it and report upon it. The committee, composed of Daniel B. Ryall and the Rev. Mr. Williams, had reported the treasurer's accounts as all correct; and as in former years, the committee's report was accepted without remark and the subject of the Convention's treasury thus dismissed in silence. But before the adjournment, the treasurer's account was again called up and the treasurer called upon to present an explicit statement of the amount and condition of the Episcopal Fund. The amount reported was $8951.57—the sum of $1475 being in bonds, and the remainder, amounting to $7476.57 being in notes of the Bishop without any security beyond his own signature. On the part of the Convention there was nothing to be done—nothing to be said; though the editor of the Banner of the Cross, with a most unaccountable assurance, gravely asserted in his account of the proceedings, that a universal satisfaction was expressed! The Bishop could only say that he wanted the money for his institutions; that he considered it safe in his hands when he appropriated it; that in the change of circumstances that had taken place in his affairs, he could not suppose the Convention would now so regard it, and that he should give security for the debt such as would be satisfactory to the Standing Committee. The precise time in which the promised security was to be given, was not specified. But the plain inference drawn by the Convention was, that it was to be given at an early day after the adjournment.

In connection with this act of assumption on the part of Bishop Doane, two or three points are especially to be noticed. The Convention is a body corporate under a charter from the legislature of New Jersey. It has a legal right therefore to hold property. Its funds, by the constitution, are given into the hands of its treasurer

in trust, the treasurer being required to give such bonds of security for the faithful discharge of his trust as the Convention may require. Unfortunately, the incumbent had not been put under such bonds. His character as a clergyman and a business man, it would seem, had led the Convention to dispense with the requirement. All funds had been regarded as safe in his keeping, and the Convention, from year to year, had quietly assumed that all was right. The Episcopal Fund, by resolution and canon, is declared to be a "*permanent* fund, the *interest* thereof to be appropriated exclusively to the support of the Bishop of the diocese." And yet, when the Bishop must have known himself very deeply involved by debt, and under a pressure which to any other eyes than his own must have seemed inextricable, he took possession of this sacred trust-fund to which he had no more legal or moral right than he had to the pockets of every Churchman within his diocese. The treasurer was a presbyter under him. He was moreover holding an office in the Bishop's own institution, and, consequently dependent on the Bishop for his place, not to say for his daily bread. And hence probably his acquiescence in the transaction. The fact was disclosed and undenied, that good securities in bonds and mortgages and in stocks had been exchanged for the Bishop's notes. He laid no blame on the treasurer, but in effect assumed himself the entire responsibility, not even setting forth the slightest moneyed claim upon the diocese. He substantially admitted that he had taken property to the amount of $7476.57, which did not belong to him, and in his inability to return it could only say that he would render for it a satisfactory, and (as was understood) a speedy security.

The Conventional year passed round, and the Standing Committee received no offer of security. The Convention again assembled. The Rev. Mr. Finch moved "That the proposition of the Bishop, at the last Convention, as to his debt to the Episcopal Fund, be referred to Daniel Babbitt, William A. Duer, and Daniel B. Ryall, to examine the securities which have been presented, and to complete the arrangements." The low small voice of the mover prevented nearly all—so far as I have been able to ascertain—*quite all*, from hearing any thing about *the completion of arrangements*. I supposed, as did others, that this committee, according to all usage, would report to the Convention, and that the Convention, not the committee, would take the final action under the resolution, or in the phraseology in which the resolution appears on the Journal, *complete the arrangements*. The committee reported on the last

day of the Convention that they had examined the securities, "and that they are satisfactory and safe." And when objection was made to this mode of proceeding, the objector was cut short—the resolution of Mr. Finch about the completion of arrangements by the committee was read—and the objector consequently declared *out of order*. He was assured, however, that all was right, and invited forward to examine the papers and satisfy himself. In doing this he was taken all aback by singing and praying preparatory to a final adjournment! The treasurer's statement of his accounts, required by the constitution to be presented to each annual Convention, had not been received, though the new treasurer was present, and is a man of reputed promptness in all his business transactions. A rule of order directs that "before the rising of the Convention, the whole proceedings of the sittings shall be read," a rule always before observed, but now unceremoniously set aside! No order was taken in regard to the printing of the Journals! And yet with all this positive, ever before *indispensable* business of the Convention unperformed, an adjournment was suddenly sprung, a suddenness for which no *good cause* can possibly be conjectured.

Now as to the security. The Bishop, and a friend, presented a bond, conjointly obligating themselves to pay $500 annually, till the debt is liquidated. This, be it observed, if the $1000 due the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge and Piety be included, and for which no other security exists, will require within a fraction of *seventeen years* to conclude the full return of the funds due. The collateral securities proposed were the assignment of a policy of insurance on the life of the Bishop for $7500, and what was said to be an extract from his friend's will, leaving the amount requisite to cover the sum in the event of her death; the position of her estate being such that the bond could be availing only for her lifetime. But this latter paper was in no way authenticated—there was not even a name attached to it. And if the will itself, signed and sealed, had been tendered, Mr. Ryall admitted that in law it could be no valid security. It may be made now, and in good faith, but it may be altered at any day; and it is very conceivable that causes may arise which would be deemed a sufficient warrant, both in law and morals, to make the alteration. There is no bond of security that the annuity will be paid on the life insurance, and a year's neglect of this will vitiate the policy. And then again, there is no provision for the payment of the interest, though by canon, one-half of the interest is required to be added to the principal. So, the pro-

mised security, it will be seen, is most dubious and frail. What business man, as a business operation, would regard such security as satisfactory in the investment of his money? If the soundness claimed for it were real, why was not some one of its few moneyed advocates found to come forward and take on his own shoulder the responsibility? why did not the Essex lawyer bring forward his quarter per cent. bondsman? or why did not the member of the committee who made the report favourably to the acceptance of the proffered securities, himself, when appealed to, give *his own endorsement* for the satisfaction of the Convention? There is no power of evading the point to which these questions lead. The diocese at large must feel that little or no security has been rendered for that money, which has been collected through long and laborious care for *permanent* aid in support of the Episcopate—which in the comparative weakness and poverty of the diocese, is an amount of vast importance to its welfare, and which without its knowledge or consent has been wrested from its lawful, legitimate, and sacred purpose, and appropriated—it knows not where! For the sin of dissatisfaction with this whole proceeding, as with other kindred matters, I have been reproachfully assailed; and it has seemed necessary to be thus explicit in order that those in the diocese who are uninformed on the subject may know whether or not the expression of this dissatisfaction is unjust or uncharitable.

The next point in the late history of affairs, which in self-defence I feel called upon to present, is that connected with a loan of $50,000 made in the spring, or early in the summer of 1848.

A meeting of some of Bishop Doane's creditors and active friends was convened at Burlington College, at which it was represented that $50,000 were needed to satisfy the pressing demands of creditors, and to enable the two institutions to move on prosperously in their work. It was alleged and urged by Professor John D. Ogilby and Mr. Jeremiah C. Garthwaite, in the Bishop's hearing, and it must of course be supposed with his sanction, that the amount proposed would be abundantly secured by a mortgage on Riverside, St. Mary's Hall, and two pieces of land, one of about twelve acres, and the other of about six, in the neighbourhood. It was said by one or both of these gentlemen that a mortgage for this amount would raise the total amount of mortgages to but $70,000, or at most to $80,000, and that the best judges had pronounced the property safely and abundantly worth this sum. It

was further asserted that the $50,000 would pay off all the Bishop's debts excepting $16,000 or $17,000, which sum would remain in a position that would not be a cause of embarrassment, and that the plan proposed, could it be accomplished, would relieve the Bishop and his institutions from the trying difficulties to which they had long been subjected. A scrip was promised and afterward given, pledging the subscribers to the loan the semi-annual payment of interest with an annual per centage of the principal. With a view of thus relieving the Bishop and advancing the interests of his institutions, subscriptions to the amount of several thousand dollars were given on the spot, and Messrs. Ogilby and Garthwaite, with some assistance (I know not how much) from the Bishop and Mr. Germain, entered on an agency for completing the subscription. With most determined and persisting effort, this was nearly or quite accomplished, though it afterwards appeared to the surprise of one at least who subscribed and paid his money, that a large proportion of the subscriptions was given by creditors in the way of *funding their own debts.* In the work of the agency undertaken by Messrs. Ogilby and Garthwaite, the statements made at the meeting were reiterated and urged on each individual appealed to; and while they who subscribed and paid, did so for the sake of aiding the Bishop and his schools, their act was a *bona fide* business operation—for they believed on the representations made, that the investment was perfectly safe, and that no risk of loss was incurred in the transaction.

Now, to the amazement of the subscribers, it was subsequently discovered that at the time of their subscribing there were, on the property above mentioned, pre-existing encumbrances to the amount of at least *fifty-six thousand and thirteen dollars.* The Bishop's deed of assignment, made in the month of March following, shows this total amount of mortgages. And then it is added, "on these four above described pieces of property there is a further mortgage of $50,000 to Isaac B. Parker and others, in trust," making the total amount $106,013, instead of the $70,000 or $80,000, as represented to the meeting at the College! And then the sixteen or seventeen thousand dollars of remaining debts are found in the same deed to be swelled out to the acknowledged sum of *one hundred and fifty-five thousand five hundred and ninety-three dollars and sixty-seven cents.* Subscribers to the loan say that they have never been able to learn what use was made of the money, for they have never heard whose debts were liquidated by it. But some of them (I know not how

many) pronounce the whole transaction a gross fraud, and say that their money was loaned in consequence of false representations that were set forth.

A few words are now necessary to explain the origin of my correspondence with Mr. Garthwaite respecting this transaction.

On reaching Newark the day before our last Convention, I was told of a report in circulation that I had been to Mount Holly, for the purpose of urging Joseph Deacon to go before the grand jury of Burlington county, to secure the presentment of Bishop Doane on charges of a criminal nature. Tracing the report directly to Joel W. Condit, I sought him in his place of business, and soon after joining him, the Rev. Mr. Southard made his appearance. Having reason to suspect Mr. Southard of helping on the circulation of the report, (as I knew he had been at Mount Holly with Bishop Doane during the recent session of the grand jury,) I expressed this suspicion, and neither of the gentlemen denied, but substantially acknowledged what I thus charged upon them. I denied, unqualifiedly, the truth of the report, while I told them all that had transpired, by way of giving it an origin. It was this: about a month previous, a gentleman had showed me, in my own house, Bishop Doane's deed of assignment. I had heard of it, and had heard it commented on at different times before. But I had never sought the sight of it, and never designed to do so. It struck me as a very sad and singular document. I made known its strange features to three different lawyers—and these gentlemen not of the meaner or more ignorant class of the profession—and their amazement, I discovered, far exceeded my own. I went to Mount Holly for the express purpose of seeing for myself, in the public office, whether the matter had been truly presented. Having two or three spare hours before I could return, I called on a friend, a zealous and faithful communicant of the Church, with whom I had much conversation respecting the state of things in the diocese. While sitting with the Rev. Mr. Morehouse in his parlour awaiting the time of the car for my return, the friend on whom I had called an hour before, walked in, and introduced Mr. Deacon. I had never before seen him. Knowing that his residence was some miles from Mount Holly, I had not the slightest expectation of seeing him. At the time, and under the circumstances, I had no wish to see him. But I heard his long story of grievances, in which he declared in emphatic and unmeasured terms that Bishop Doane had, time after time, practised upon him deception, falsehood, and fraud, and that he had been ruined in conse-

quence. I asked him whether he intended again to go before the grand jury, or whether he would furnish affidavits of what he had then, and by report very often before repeated. He was not prepared to give affidavits, he said, at that time, but he should present the Bishop before the grand jury, unless he was relieved before the sitting of the court from an amount of $8000 or $10,000 of judgment bonds, that were hanging over him in consequence of his endorsments for the Bishop, and which he had no means of his own to meet. I *gave no opinion about the course he should pursue.* I *expressed no wish in regard to his line of action.* I *gave him no advice.* Mr. Morehouse was a listener to every word that passed, and I can appeal to him for the strict correctness of this declaration. Mr. Deacon was evidently desirous to see me, as a clergyman of the Church, for he said that he thought the Church in a measure obligated to him for the enormous and ruinous losses he had sustained. My simple answer, of course, to this was, that all legal and business action of the Church, as such, was through the Convention; but that the schools and their affairs in Burlington were the schools of Bishop Doane, and that they had never received any official recognition by the Church. I claimed of Messrs. Condit and Southard that they ought to contradict the false story to which they did not pretend to deny that they had given currency. I know not but that this claim was justly and generously regarded. But I do know that the story was reiterated at different times for two days after by others, and that the second assignee of Bishop Doane repeated it to a relative with a contemptible addition, when he knew better, or when he might very easily have been better informed.

From this matter the conversation with Messrs. Condit and Southard turned to other points affecting the reputation and character of the Bishop and the Church, and amongst the rest to that respecting the $50,000 loan.

That Mr. Garthwaite has for some time past been a prominent and active layman, and that he has been intimately associated with the affairs of the Church and of certain institutions in the diocese, is a fact every where known to the Churchmen of New Jersey. Hence I earnestly insisted that his conduct in the matter of the loan ought to be explained; that gentlemen of the highest honour and respectability were charging him with gross deception, and that, so far as I could learn, he suffered the charge to go uncontradicted; that inasmuch as the money raised on the alleged false pretences was avowedly for the benefit of the Church, and for extend-

ing the benefits of education within it, the reputation of the Church and of our holy religion was seriously involved; that, consequently, he ought to be called to an account, and that, if he could not acquit himself of the charges, the odium ought to be left to settle on him, and not on the Church, for which he had been professing to labour. I charged nothing on the Bishop. But inasmuch as Messrs. Garthwaite and Ogilby had been active in raising the money in behalf of his institutions, their conduct indirectly, yet seriously, involved him. They were his agents, and their course of action might be supposed to be with his knowledge and consent.

Whether this conversation was to be repeated to Mr. Garthwaite, or not, was a question that did not for a moment occur to my mind, and consequently I had no expectation of hearing from him on the subject. But though altogether unsought and unlooked for, I was not greatly surprised by the first letter. I suppose the writer may have fancied that his threatening innuendo, together with the *quasi* Episcopal admonition, would awe me into a respectful silence, and that, so far as I was concerned at least, the allegations against his character would be laid down into a most comfortable repose. The reader will mark the contrast between the assurance of the first letter and the subdued and gentle tone of the last two.

NEWARK, May 31, 1850.

REV. SIR,—I was informed late last evening by the Rev. Mr. Southard and Mr. J. W. Condit, you had stated to them, that in the application for the loan of $50,000 on the property at Riverside, I had given false assurances to certain gentlemen at Mount Holly, as to the extent of the existing encumbrances or security proposed; that the Rev. Professor Ogilby, who united in the application, was excusable, to a degree, for his statement, by being deceived by me who knew better, accompanied by a declaration of your belief in the truth of these things, and similar remarks of disrespect towards me which you indulged in.

My present purpose is to pronounce the whole false and a base slander, and to inquire of you the name of your informants, and as in duty bound to you to guard you as to the future, reserving the privilege of pursuing the course that may appear advisable or duty may seem to require.

Respectfully yours, J. C. GARTHWAITE.

TRENTON, May 31, 1850.

DEAR SIR,—Yours of this morning is received, and I am very glad of the opportunity thus afforded of referring you to *Mr. Black*, Prest. of the Mount Holly Bank, to *Messrs. Dobbins, Bispham*, and *Irick*, of Mount Holly, and to *Doct. J. J. Spencer*, of Moorestown, for the truth of all I have said in regard to your application for money on loan in 1848.

There is one point in your statement of my observations as made to Messrs. Southard and Condit (though not perhaps of essential importance) that requires a word of correction. I did not charge you as deceiving Professor Ogilby. I said in effect that it had been observed by others, that Prof. Ogilby *may have been* in ignorance of the actual state of things, and may have been deceived by you—that you, being more of the business man, may have been relied on by him in reference to the amount of pre-existing mortgages, &c. I claimed no actual *knowledge* on this point, saying that this view appeared a very probable one. My belief of your own culpability in the transaction was at the same time fully expressed.

I have only to add, that if it shall be found on the result of your inquiries, that I have done any injustice to your name and character, you may rely on the amplest reparation in my power to make. Truly yours,

S. STARR.

NEWARK, June 1, 1850.

REV. SIR,—If you have correctly quoted the gentlemen you refer to, they have misunderstood me. I have that confidence and regard for them respectively, as to believe they would not willingly utter so gross a falsehood and base slander as that you repeated, and as stated in my letter of yesterday. The reference to Professor Ogilby is no less a one. I deem it "of essential importance," you state, "that it had been observed by others." I request their names. I learn from two or three witnesses you were emphatic in your declarations. It is not for me to judge you, or of your motives, but my duty to you as a neighbour, a christian brother, and more especially a clergyman of the church of God, leads me directly to you to guard you, and for information.

Respectfully yours, J. C. GARTHWAITE.

NEWARK, June 3, 1850.

REV. SIR,—I am further informed, but inadvertently omitted to refer to it in my last, that you have reported, as coming from me, that the newly formed parish of "The House of Prayer," in this city, was intended, or it was expected to have, (or words to this effect) an injurious effect upon the parish of Belleville. I am not aware of any grounds even for such a story, I have not entertained such an idea, much less expressed it—it is utterly untrue—indeed, nothing would afford me more pleasure and cause of devout gratitude to God, than the prosperity of the venerable parish at Belleville. May I ask you to furnish me the author of this falsehood, that I may, as I intend to in the other cases, pursue it thoroughly. Respectfully,

J. C. GARTHWAITE.

TRENTON, June 3, 1850.

DEAR SIR,—Your last communication, of the 1st inst., is altogether unsatisfactory, and I must freely say that it looks to me very much as if you are disinclined to meet the true issue of the question before us.

The charge with which you open the subject is, that I have stated to Messrs. Southard and Condit that in your application to certain gentlemen for the loan of $50,000 you "gave them false assurances as to the extent of the existing encumbrances or security proposed." You pronounce this "false and a base slander," and inquire for "the names of my informants." In my reply I acknowledged that I gave currency to the report, and referred you to five gentlemen, by name, for the truth of all I uttered. It strikes me, and I think it would strike any honest and ingenuous mind, that you should follow the "base slander," as you term it, to its source, and meet your original accusers face to face. But instead of such a straight forward and natural proceeding, you seem to satisfy yourself by merely saying to me that if I have "*correctly quoted the gentlemen referred to, they have misunderstood you!!*

Now, though you may be thus easily satisfied, I am not; and as you still speak of my statement to Messrs. Southard and Condit as a "gross falsehood and base slander," I shall hold you accountable, insisting that you pursue the question and see whether what I have said be "*falsehood* and *slander*" or *naked truth*. I am perfectly satisfied that the gentlemen to whom I have referred you are all ready, and that at least *one* of them is *anxious* to meet you in reference to the subject. You can learn from them whether they *misunderstood* you in regard to a statement in consequence of which they conjointly subscribed and paid the sum of $2750. If you are aggrieved by what you term falsehood and slander, as coming from me, I have a moral right to *demand*, especially as you have required and received the names of my informants, that you carry back and visit your charges upon *them*. I repeat, that if it shall appear that I have done you injustice, I shall cheerfully retract what I have said, and with a satisfactory acknowledgment of my error.

As to the matter of Prof. Ogilby, it is altogether incidental, and it must not be dragged in to avert the main issue. He will have given him the opportunity of answering for himself when he shall have recrossed the ocean. I have never spoken with him on the subject. But in the many conversations that have been held, and in the expressions of virtuous indignation that have been uttered by many individuals, and in different places, for a year past, an apprehension that Prof. Ogilby may have been misled, and by you too in the matter, has been many times expressed. And I will add further, that I heard it stated months ago that he had acknowledged himself in error in regard to the representations either set forth or sanctioned by him. But of this I know nothing with certainty, nor have I ever claimed to know any thing. Mr. Southard will remember that it was by Mr. Gifford's gate that he asked whether I believed "that Prof. Ogilby could be guilty of such wilful misrepresentations?" It was in answer to this, that I quoted the wide spread suspicion that he might have been misled, and stated merely the idea that this did not seem to me improbable. The first and main offence has been charged upon you directly, and they from whom it originated can easily be reached, where you can hear their story. It seems to me that you might do something toward disposing of this first list of names before looking so eagerly after others. Still, the other names you ask for I would cheerfully fur-

nish, but I eannot do it with the same certainty as those you already have. I think, however, that the Mount Holly gentlemen and Dr. Spencer will satisfy your inquiries on this poiut as well as on that which is first and so vastly the weightier.

Just before finishing the above, your further letter of to-day is received. I refer you to the Rev. Mr. Paterson, of Princeton, for the adjustment of this last "falsehood." With his full permission, I have already given his name to Mr. Southard, and it appears to me that Mr. Southard, *had he chosen so to do*, might have himself referred you a step farther back.* Though I feel no exhaustion whatever, as yet, from the eontest, I think it but fair that you turn a little of your artillery in other directions.

Truly yours, &c., S. STARR.

NEWARK, June 5, 1850.

REV. SIR,—Your letter of 3d inst. is received. By permission, I beg to be classed as "honest and ingenuous minded," and to "proceed straight forward and natural," it strikes me as it does you, "that I should pursue the Mt. Holly matter to its source," and that you have "a moral right to demand it," yea, more, and to expect a return of the $2750 robbed, which, be assured, will be done and four-fold, if God gives me the ability, should it appear that I am in the slightest degree eulpable.

As to the story of Prof. Ogilby, it is, it appears to me, in evidence that it is mere suspicion, without beginning or end; as to any acknowledgments Prof. O. has made, I am ignorant; I do know, however, that both he and myself are entirely iunocent *of the charge made.* I speak what I do know, and I assume every and all responsibility iu the premises that attaches to him, not however from any reference to "the wide spread suspicions, by many individuals, and in different places," which is regarded, I am almost tempted to say, "with a virtuous indignation," but I will not, God forbid it, there is but one Judge who knows all things, but from a high regard for an absent friend and truly an honest man.

Tho Belleville story can sleep; I learn on inquiry, that it was so qualified that I am willing to accept it, as stated to me, if desired, but deny giving occasion for the rumor by "thought, word or action."

Respectfully yours, J. C. GARTHWAITE.

TRENTON, July 3, 1850.

DEAR SIR,—In your last communication, bearing date the 5th ult., you express yourself in the following language: "It strikes me as it does you that I should pursue the Mt. Holly matter to its source, and that you have a moral right to demand it."

Now, I have waited with utmost patience for four weeks, and have ascertained that you have not, as yet, approached any of the gentlemen to whom I referred you, either in persou or by letter. And as I yet stand charged by you with giving utterance to a *base slander*, and as you seem to me to be singularly tardy

* I received a note from Mr. Southard the day following, saying that he *had given Mr. Paterson's name* to Mr. Garthwaite, but that Mr. Garthwaite preferred reeeiving it direct from me.

in bringing tho question before the referees for a settlement, I write again to inquire whether you actually intend to confer with them at all? and if so, how much longer time you desire for the purpose?

I will thank you to give me an explicit answer to these questions, and at your earliest convenience. Truly yours,

Mr. J. C. Garthwaite. S. STARR.

P. S. Permit me to add to my list of references the name of *Judge McHenry*. Though he was not induced to become a subscriber to the $50,000 loan, he claims to have a distinct recollection of the statements made by you respecting the securities, the efficient and permanent relief it would afford the Bishop, &c.

Newark, July 3, 1850.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—In reply to your inquiry of 3d inst., "whether you actually intend to confer with them (referees) at all, and if so, how much longer time you desire for the purpose," I have to state that I do intend to perform, as in all cases when I promise, and at my earliest convenience. I have not forgotten the subject, as you seem to fear, nor entirely neglected it. Permit me to add, if my accusers, in intent and by implication, had taken the line marked out by them for me, and had come direct to me for information, as in duty bound, the base slanders would have been put at rest forthwith. I do not envy their *position* in the premises, even if guilty of the charges. I would greatly prefer *mine*.

Respectfully yours, J. C. GARTHWAITE.

It will be remarked, in his second letter, that Mr. Garthwaite speaks of the persons to whom I referred him as "gentlemen," in whom he has "too much confidence and regard to believe that they could utter so gross a falsehood and base slander" as that I repeated. And yet, since the close of the correspondence, I have learned, and on authority which I know to be of the strongest possible kind, that, on the very day of his first letter to me, *he sent a verbal message to these same gentlemen that he was going to prosecute them for slander*. The gentleman charged with the message, and from whose own lips I have received the information, declined, by the advice of Bishop Doane, to deliver it.

I have delayed this entire publication several weeks, awaiting Mr. Garthwaite's course. After looking more than a month in vain for some movement from him, I believed that he intended to avoid any action in reference to the charge laid against him. This I know was the belief of the gentlemen themselves, for Mr. Black, in speaking of the transaction, said that *he knew better than to come near them*—a remark that was in substance repeated by the other gentlemen concerned. I have no skill in the arts of concealment,

and I have freely said that the subject should not rest without an exposure. I think I can clearly trace the channel through which this avowed determination reached Mr. Garthwaite; but I may be mistaken in my conjecture, and it may be that the avowal of my intention to publish the correspondence had nothing to do in the way of stimulating him to action. But he has, at last, been to the gentlemen for an interview, and he has received a very cool satisfaction for his pains. He has heard all from them that he has learned through others, and if I am rightly informed, something more. He has utterly failed to draw out the slightest retraction or qualification of that which has been charged against him. His present declaration is, that he distinctly stated on his application for the subscriptions that the amount of encumbrances on the property to be mortgaged was $45,500, and when asked whether he might not have been himself mistaken, emphatically answers *No!* Now this happens to turn out most unfortunately for him. The records of the Clerk's office represent the pre-existing mortgages to be $65,-113.33. And supposing some part of this sum to have been cancelled, the Bishop's Deed of Assignment presents the acknowledged amount of $56,013. So on the least calculation Mr. Garthwaite is yet wide of the truth to the extent of $10,513.

This correspondence, as will be seen, has been forced upon me. I have a strong dislike for controversy in any form. But I have a dislike stronger still for iniquity, duplicity and fraud. And when a man that is conspicuous as a leader in the affairs of the diocese, a known confidant and active agent too of the Bishop in regard to his moneyed affairs and his institutions, assaults me with a charge that is abusive and false—when he is met, and recoils before the simple weapon of truth, and without the magnanimity to withdraw his slanderous charge, I cannot see the duty of screening him by a silent submission.

The next subject in reference to which I have been guilty of the sin of talking, and for which I have been visited with no small measure of abuse, is that growing out of Bishop Doane's Deed of Assignment, and of which mention has already been made.

I had intended to state briefly, and in language of my own, the parts of this Deed that have been the cause of censorious comment. But it has been suggested to me that in doing so, I should expose myself to the charge of unfair and garbled quotation, and that inasmuch as whatever is by law recorded in the public office is thereby

made public property, so far as the world's observation is involved, I had better print it entire. This I have resolved to do. It will be found complete at the close of this pamphlet, and precisely as exhibited by the certified copy that has been placed in my hands.

By the statute law, in such cases made and provided, the debtor is required to furnish under oath or affirmation, a full and perfect inventory of all his estate, real and personal. He is not bound by the law of New Jersey to make oath or affirmation to the *valuation* of his estate—this duty being required of the assignees. But usage, I understand from members of the Bar, has established this as the ordinary course of proceeding; and when this oath of valuation is made by the debtor, it is regarded in law and morals as *his own act*. In the deed it will be perceived, Bishop Doane makes oath that *as near as he can ascertain*, the value of the Pianos in St. Mary's Hall is *thirty dollars and ninety-five cents each*, and these are the instruments employed for teaching music in an institution that has ever claimed to be unsurpassed for its advantages, and to have the *best of means* provided for perfecting knowledge in every department of education. The Bishop takes his oath that as near as he can ascertain, the bedsteads in the same institution are worth *fifty cents* each—the carpeting and oil-cloth of the entire establishment, *thirty-five dollars*, and so on. And then in his own house we have under the same solemn oath, the carpet, rugs, oil-cloth and blinds of his library valued at *eighteen dollars;* the chairs, stove, stools, hat-stands, oil-cloth, pictures and rugs of the hall, at *thirty dollars;* his household linen at *sixty dollars;* his plate at *three hundred dollars*, &c., &c.

It has been said to me in vindication of the Bishop, by one of the gentlemen concerned in his affairs, that all this work was done for him by others—that they figured out the whole thing—told him that it was all right, and that on their prescription the oath was taken. And when the same gentleman claimed that no motive could be assigned for an intended under-valuation, I could only refer him to the extensive impression that the sale was a fraud upon the creditors; that it was arranged beforehand that the property should all be *bought in* and remain where it was before, that nothing like the market value was obtained for it, and that to make out an appearance of consistency in the two parts of the transaction, the amounts of valuation and sale must be so arranged as to tally, the one with the other. But of all this I expressly disclaimed to the gentleman all personal knowledge or any settled personal opinion.

The statute law directs the debtor, on oath or affirmation, to make a true, full, and perfect list of his creditors, with the amounts severally due them. The law, in the case of Bishop Doane, is complied with, and the oath, sworn and subscribed to, is given. The peculiarly sad point in the appearance of this part of the transaction is, that while $1000 are accredited to the Rev. A. Stubbs, as treasurer of the diocesan Society for the promotion of Christian Knowledge and Piety, no acknowledgment or notice is made of the $7467.57 due the Episcopal Fund. And the appearance is the more sad from the fact, that at the time the assignment was made, the position of this fund was known to very few indeed, if to any in the diocese beyond the Bishop, the treasurer, and a committee of the Bishop's own appoining, to adjust accounts with the treasurer. The disclosure was brought out in Convention two months after the list of creditors was made and the oath affixed and taken.

Now I have not judged Bishop Doane in these matters of his assignment, nor in any other; and Heaven forbid that I should. But I have said, and still say, and shall continue to say, that in the name of every thing that is honest and true, the apparent bad features of the transaction ought to be removed from the document, if it can be done. And if this cannot be done, and if it can be shown in explanation that the Bishop be not accountable, then let the reproach fall on those to whom it justly belongs.

The very convenient answer to these several matters will doubtless be, as it has always been hitherto, *animosity, animosity to the Bishop!* It is sad, and amusing at the same time, to see with what holy and implicit reliance some men can assume that their own Rt. Rev. Father can do no wrong, and who seem to consider it sacrilege to doubt for a moment his infallibility, while at the same time they can exercise a most unlicensed judgment over the doctrines and conduct of other Rt. Rev. Fathers in the Church, and abuse with a most righteous sincerity any brother of our spiritual household whose sentiments and language happen to differ from their own. Animosity to Bishop Doane! *Why? For what?* I have never had with him any personal quarrel. I know of but one or two clergymen in the diocese who have ever complained of him on the score of personal grievance. It is true that he has not always, particularly in Convention, shown himself quite so "gentle" as could have been desired, nor have his admonitions been always quite so "godly" as in the "private judgment" of some of us they

might have been. But I think it has generally been considered that any supposed acts of overbearing have been submitted to with a very commendable spirit of Christian philosophy. For myself, I have never been disposed to let these things interfere with the freest personal and official intercourse. No: the causes of complaint are *not personal.* The Church in the diocese is sorely suffering (it were very easy to illustrate the declaration) in consequence of unexplained facts that are widely known, and of the uncontradicted rumors that are abroad concerning her spiritual head.

I publish this statement, extended perhaps too far—though it might easily be extended much farther—after much calm and anxious deliberation. I repeat it, I have no idea of being for ever marked down as an unprovoked calumniator without a word of remonstrance and defence. In justification of what I have said, and of what I shall no doubt say again, I have been obliged to present some facts of a painful character, but facts, which, since they exist, and with such an extent of notoriety, I humbly insist ought to to undergo an impartial adjudication. I have said nothing—I here publish nothing but that the truth of which I am abundantly able to maintain. If any one who may feel aggrieved doubts this, he is perfectly welcome to put me to the proof. While I "*defy*" no one, I am perfectly fearless in the position I have taken. I understand fully the fresh editions of abuse that will be poured out against me. I can well fancy certain quarters in which the utmost pains will be taken, and without much scrupulous care as to the nature of the means used, to bring discredit on the fairness of my statements and the bitterest enmity against myself. But all this, like every thing else of the same kind that has preceded it, will pass by without disturbing my repose. I think I can safely appeal to those who have known me longest and best, especially to my parishioners, amongst whom now for many years I have lived and moved in peace and love, whether *malevolence of disposition* is a marked feature of my character, or whether I am given to forming rash and uncharitable conclusions respecting the motives and conduct of my neighbours. But on subjects that nearly and deeply involve the good name, the prosperity and advancement of the Church of God, I have a right as a member and minister of that Church to speak, and that right I shall be very slow to surrender. For, I know when I speak of the reproach now visited (I say not whether justly or unjustly) upon our diocese, I stand on the firm ground of honesty, righteousness and truth. No one can more reverence the Episcopal office than

I do, or ever be disposed to show an incumbent more of just support and respect. And it is because I reverence it so much, and because I estimate so highly its proper influence for good, that I would have it kept as pure as possible in the eyes of an observing and a criticising world. It must be kept pure and above all apparent grounds of reproach, that it may be respected and be suffered to work out its leading and influential part in the regeneration, renovation, and salvation of mankind.

GEORGE W. DOANE
to
GARRET S. CANNON *et al.*

This indenture, made the 26th day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-nine, between George W. Doane, of the city and county of Burlington, and state of New Jersey, party of the first part, and Garret S. Cannon and Robert B. Aertsen, of the county and state aforesaid, party of the second part, Witnesseth, that the said George W. Doane, for the purpose of securing to his creditors an equal distribution of his estate, and for the consideration of one dollar, to him in hand paid by the said Garret S. Cannon and Robert B. Aertsen, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, hath granted, bargained, and sold, conveyed and assigned, and by these presents doth grant, bargain, sell, convey and assign unto the said Garret S. Cannon and Robert B. Aertsen, and to their heirs and assigns, and to the survivor of them, his heirs and assigns, all and singular the lands, tenements, hereditaments and real estate whereof the said George W. Doane is now seized or possessed, or in any way entitled to, wheresoever the same may be situate, together with the appurtenances, and also all and singular his goods and chattels, bonds, notes, books of account, contracts, rights and credits whatsoever and wheresoever: to have and to hold the same, and every part and parcel thereof, unto the said Garret S. Cannon and Robert B. Aertsen, their heirs and assigns, as joint tenants, and to the survivor of them, his heirs and assigns, for ever. In trust, to sell, collect and dispose of the same, and distribute the proceeds to the creditors of the said George W. Doane in proportion to their several just demands, pursuant to the directions of the act of the legislature of the state of New Jersey, entitled an act to secure to creditors an equal and just division of the estates of debtors who convey to assignees for the benefit of creditors, and in further trust to pay the surplus, if any there be, after fully satisfying and paying the said creditors, and all proper costs and charges to the said George W. Doane. In witness whereof the said George W. Doane hath hereunto set his hand and seal the day and year first above written. G. W. DOANE, [L. S.]

Signed, sealed, and delivered in the presence of

JOEL W. CONDIT,
JNO. J. CHETWOOD.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, *ss.*

Be it remembered, that on the twenty-sixth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-nine, before me, the subscriber, one of the masters of the court of chancery of said state, personally appeared George W. Doane, who is, I am satisfied, the grantor named in the foregoing deed of assignment, and who, the contents of the same being by me first made known to him, acknowledged that he signed, sealed, and delivered the same as his voluntary act and deed for the uses and purposes therein mentioned, all which is certified by me. JNO. J. CHETWOOD, *Master in Chancery.*

An inventory of the estate, real and personal, of George W. Doane, of the city and county of Burlington, assigned to Garret S. Cannon and Robert Aertsen, for the benefit of his creditors, together with a list of his creditors and the amount of their respective claims.

INVENTORY OF ESTATE.

REAL ESTATE.

No. 1. Dwelling house and buildings, with the premises known as St. Mary's Hall, fronting on the Delaware river, and bounded on the east by Ellis street, on the south by Pearl street, and on the west by the homestead property of G. W. Doane, known as Riverside, subject to a mortgage for $7000 to J. Deacon, also to another mortgage to J. Deacon for $8000, also to a mortgage to I. B. Parker and others in trust for $10,800—valued at	$1 00
No. 2. The homestead property known as Riverside, fronting on the Delaware river, and bounded on the east by St. Mary's Hall, on the south by Pearl street, and on the west by Reed street, subject to a mortgage to J. Deacon for $5000; also a mortgage to H. R. Cleveland, in trust for $15,000; also to a mortgage to L. Carter for $10,000, on which about $4000 has been paid—valued at	1 00
No. 3. A farm containing twelve acres, more or less, lying between Burlington College property and the railroad, subject to a mortgage to Wm. Chester for $800; also to a mortgage to Sarah C. Robardet for $3000—valued at	1 00
No. 4. A piece of meadow and pasture ground, about six acres, near London Bridge creek, in the township of Burlington, subject to a mortgage to ——— Woolman for $300, and also to a mortgage to Mrs. Vandegrift for $113—valued at	1 00
On these four above described pieces of property, there is a further mortgage of $50,000 to Isaac B. Parker and others, in trust.	
Nos. 5, 6, and 7, are three lots of 50 feet each, on Pearl street, in the rear of Burlington College, and adjoining property of T. B. Woolman, subject to two small mortgages, together $230—valued at	670 00
	$674 00

FURNITURE, HOUSEHOLD GOODS, &c., IN BURLINGTON COLLEGE.

In Parlour.	
Sofa, chairs, table, lamp, Bible, vases, stove, carpet,	25 00
Library.	
Desk, chairs, washstand, looking glass,	10 00
Front Hall.	
Stove, oil-cloth, rugs, stair carpet,	3 50
Dining Hall.	
Tables, stove, table cloths, cups and saucers, soup tureens, tumblers, bells, &c.,	40 00

Do. large and small knives and forks, dinner plates and dinner ware generally, in its variety,	$100 00
Dormitories.	
135 Bedsteads, beds and mattresses, comfortables, counterpanes, blankets, pillows, &c., sheets, pillow-cases, napkins, towels, washstands, bowls, &c.,	600 00
Do. pails, looking glasses, oil-cloth, desks, glass lamps, wardrobes, &c., &c.,	25 00
Furniture in School room,	250 00
Do. in Junior Hall,	240 00
Do. in Infirmary,	13 00
Do. in Teachers' and recitation rooms,	22 00
Do. in Kitchen,	30 00
Do. in Basement rooms,	15 00
2 Boats,	50 00
FURNITURE, HOUSEHOLD GOODS IN ST. MARY'S HALL.	
21 Piano Fortes,	650 00
175 Bedsteads,	87 50
Beds and Bedding, 175,	1000 00
Washstands, bowls and pitchers,	90 00
Carpeting and oil cloth,	35 00
Looking glasses, chairs and tables, and settees,	75 00
	$4,035 00
Desks, apparatus, shelves, minerals, books,	150 00
Tables, plates, knives and forks, spoons, tea-sets, tea and coffee pots, &c.,	300 00
Kitchen furniture, bath room furniture,	50 00
Stoves and pipe, &c.,	75 00
FURNITURE, HOUSEHOLD GOODS, &C., AT RIVERSIDE.	
Library.	
Desks, chairs, sofa, engravings, stands, &c.,	70 00
Carpet, rugs, oil-cloth, blinds,	18 00
Library, consisting of about 6500 volumes and pamphlets,	7,000 00
In Hall.	
Chairs, stove, stools, hat stands, oil-cloth, pictures, rugs,	30 00
Inner Hall.	
Ottomans, sofas, rugs, table, oil-cloths,	50 00
Back Parlour.	
Cabinet, book-shelf, sofa, mahogany chairs, table and cover, carpet and rug, work stand, pictures, looking glass, mantel and table ornaments, window curtains, stands, &c.,	146 50
Drawing Room.	
Pictures, sofa, ottomans, chairs, tables, centre table and cover, work stand, figure and pedestal, clock and mantel ornaments, carpet and rug, vases,	173 00
Dining Room.	
Sideboard, clock and mantel ornaments, case of drawers, looking	

glass, dining table, side table, chairs, shovel and tongs, screen, &c., carpet and rug, pictures, dumb waiter,	$127 00
Entry and Stairs.	
Stair carpeting and oil-cloth, blinds,	45 00
Oil-cloth and carpeting in entries on second floor,	20 00
River Chamber.	
Bedstead and bedding, sofa, arm-chair, windsor chairs, window curtains, bureau, chest of drawers, washstand and furniture, stool, table and cover, carpet, mantel ornaments, pictures, andirons, &c.,	95 00
Garden Chamber.	
Bedstead and bedding, washstand and furniture, bureau and glass, chairs, carpet, table and stool, audirons, &c., prints, window curtains,	52 50
Jerusalem Chamber.	
Bedstead and bedding, bureau and glass, washstands and furniture, wardrobe, carpet, chairs, stand, prints,	49 00
First Floor Chamber.	
Bedstead and bedding, looking glass, bureaus, steps, tables, chairs, carpet, wardrobes, curtains, audirons, &c., washstand, &c.,	195 00
Third Floor Chamber.	
Stair carpet, bedsteads and bedding, carpet, wardrobes, blinds, pictures,	61 00
Furniture in servants' chamber,	25 00
" " " "	15 00
Basement Room.	
Bookcase, bureau, table, washstands, &c., chairs, carpet, stove,	30 00
Nursery.	
Bedstead and bedding, carpet, washstand, &c., bureaus, chairs,	24 00
China $115, household linen $60,	175 00
Plate $300, contents of cellar $150,	450 00
Kitchen furniture,	30 00
Conservatory and green-house,	150 00
Farming Stock, &c.	
11 Cows, 30 pigs, 2 carts, 1 wagon, 3 ploughs, cultivator, harrow, 5 horses, 2 carriages, garden tools, boiler,	760 00
Washhouse utensils,	25 00
Two protested notes due by William Foster, for $260, considered of no value,	
My claim upon the trustees of Burlington College for taxes, insurance and interest paid,	1,500 00
(Exclusive of any claim I may may have for buildings and permanent improvements on the property of the College.)	

Due from Pupils in St. Mary's Hall.

From Miss Jane Henry,	$135 00
" " Eliza M. Cutchen,	150 00
" " Anna Prior,	75 00
" " Rebecca Bennet,	38 00

From Miss Margaret Johnson,	$112 50	
" " Elizabeth Lervop,	135 00	
" " Isabella Lervop,	135 00	
" " Anna Lawton,	277 00	
" " Francis Van Allen,	150 00	
" " Fanny Jessup,	150 00	
" " Helen Burroughs,	135 00	
		$1,492 50
		$17,413 50

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, } to wit,
Burlington County, }

George W. Doane, being duly sworn upon the Holy Evangelists of Almighty God, doth depose and say, that the above is a true and perfect inventory of all his real and personal property, together with the value thereof, as near as he can ascertain, and further saith not.

G. W. DOANE.

Sworn and subscribed before me the twenty-ninth day of March, eighteen hundred and forty-nine. JOHN RODGERS, *Master in Chancery.*

LIST OF CREDITORS.

Bond to the Female Benevolent Society,	$600 00
" " Sarah Vanseiver,	400 00
" " Rev. A. Stubbs, treasurer,	1000 00
" " Samuel Haddon,	400 00
Joseph Deacon, endorsements,	23,450 00
Michael Hays, "	17,500 00
Lawson Carter, "	6,000 00
Sundry notes, whose endorsers are uncertain,	4,447 36
J. C. Garthwaite, endorsements,	1,470 45
Jos. L. Powell, "	2,000 00
William S. Faitoute, Newark,	2,508 00
Thomas B. Woolman, Burlington,	4,030 35
Thomas Dugdale & Son, "	2,375 00
Taylor & Dugdale, "	2,794 74
Thomas Milnor, "	2,951 26
Thomas Dutton, "	2,494 31
David Harmer, "	449 92
Francis Roth, "	1,241 31
John Mitchell, "	118 29
Geo. P. Mitchell, "	611 54
William Stone, "	507 83
A. A. Sloan, "	670 80
R. H. Parson, "	1,152 06
F. Woolman, " about	1,000 00
Sundry notes endorsed by R. J. Germain, and negotiated by F. Woolman,	1,983 25
C. Hand, Burlington,	44 48
Mrs. C. Lippincott, "	11,951 67

Mrs. A. L. Winslow,	Burlington,	$1,700 00
George D. Winslow,	"	1,000 00
Isaac B. Parker,	"	5,946 09
William H. Carse,	"	519 13
Sundry bills contracted by W. H. Carse for me,		592 37
J. A. Shreve,	Burlington,	787 47
William Reek,	"	376 56
William B. Price,	"	451 05
Wardrop J. Hall,	"	127 58
J. W. Fenimore,	"	22 50
B. Fenimore,	" about	1,350 00
Jos. Pedrick,	"	53 00
W. J. Allinson,	"	181 95
W. C. Myers,	"	63 24
S. C. Atkinson,	"	153 43
Edward Connor,	"	279 16
D. S. Read,	"	23 48
Warren Scott,	"	67 60
Charles Johnson,	"	1,461 16
——— Vandegrift,	"	40 00
R. Blackwood,	"	137 00
Edmund Morris,	"	135 62
William A. Rogers,	"	114 46
S. Hanse,	"	127 86
Brown & Stevenson,	"	338 75
James Germain,	"	5,956 39
Ira V. Germain,	"	3,293 00
R. J. Germain,	"	1,000 00
Mrs. Bishop,	"	300 00
Rev. S. W. Hallowell,	"	650 00
Geo. W. Hewitt,	"	595 00
Signor Palidini,	"	565 00
A. Engstrom,	"	2,012 00
G. Kax Wagner,	"	299 00
William Fife,	"	80 00
Miss Loley,	"	375 00
Mrs. Lamotte,	"	150 00
Miss Stanley,	"	450 00
Miss Chamberlain,	"	264 00
Miss Lane,	"	683 87
Miss Crough,	"	375 00
Miss Barrington,	"	150 00
Miss Thompson,	"	540 00
Miss Matthews,	"	170 00
Miss Germain,	"	425 00
Miss Morgan,	"	87 50
Miss Hall,	"	200 00
Miss Whittlesey,	"	225 00
Miss Brook,	"	100 00

Miss Hewitt,	Burlington,	$135 00
Dr. Baquet,	"	670 00
Rev. J. H. Bradin,	"	1,000 00
Mr. Hyde,	"	299 00
Mr. Billsbey,	"	90 00
Mr. Trimble,	"	100 00
Mr. Barrington,	"	100 00
Mr. Holden,	"	200 00
Mr. Tuttle,	"	190 00
Mr. Mitchell,	"	225 00
Mr. Crooke,	"	100 00
Mr. Tenher,	"	250 00
Mr. Swoope,	"	100 00
Mr. Green,	"	65 00
Mrs. Clark,	"	46 60
Miss Alison,	"	100 00
Servants and employees at College and St. Mary's Hall,		1,490 15
Munsig & Bowman,	Albany,	2,074 66
D. F. Fell & Co.,	Philadelphia,	449 15
C. P. Wayne & Son,	"	298 11
Gillespie & Robinson,	"	368 63
Morgan & Co.,	"	996 00
L. J. Levey,	"	102 78
H. L. Lipman,	"	106 30
P. B. Gustine,	"	30 00
M. P. Mitchell,	"	225 00
W. I. Maddock,	"	410 97
J. Hastings,	"	277 61
Smith & Hodgson,	"	71 65
E. C. Knight,	"	84 84
Baily & Co.,	"	212 65
Fred. Brown,	"	192 50
Carey & Hart,	"	122 05
John Pennington,	"	143 24
Tyndale & Mitchell,	"	75 55
C. Oakford,	"	21 00
W. Y. Mason,	"	17 00
J. P. Mop,	"	37 65
——— Johnson,	"	50 00
Zeiber & Co.,	"	38 00
E. Townsend,	"	21 00
T. Sharpless & Son,	"	912 17
W. D. Parish & Co.,	"	20 42
Joseph Brown,	"	10 38
F. S. Cowpland,	"	40 00
G. S. Appleton,	"	393 67
Philip Reilly,	"	649 57
E. C. & J. Biddle,	"	824 62
N. Souders,	"	51 75
Eagle Foundry, Mt. Holly,		432 77

G. P. Putuam,	New York,	$71 50
J. Wiley,	"	600 00
D. Appleton & Co.,	"	57 00
D. Dana,	"	20 00
Stanford & Swords,	"	15 00
Harper & Brothers,	"	217 06
Leavitt, Trow & Co.,	"	31 25
	forward,	$145,081 59
Berard & Munden, New York,		91 00
Ward & Exall, Newark, about		150 00
Little & Browu, Boston,		53 08
Sundry small items, say		100 00
		$145,475 67
John Wiley, New York,		118 00
		$145,593 67
Claims of W. J. Hall and A. A. Sloan against the building erected on Burlington College property, amount unknown, but supposed not to exceed ten thousand dollars,		10,000 00
		$155,593 67

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, *Burlington County*, } to wit,

George W. Doane, being duly sworn according to law, upon his oath doth depose and say that the above is a true, full, and perfect list of his creditors, with the amounts severally due to them, as far as he hath been able to ascertain, according to the best of his knowledge, and further saith not.

G. W. DOANE.

Sworn and subscribed this twenty-ninth day of March, eighteen hundred and forty-niue, before me. JOHN RODGERS, *Master in Chancery.*

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, *Burlington County, ss.* } I, Benjamin Buckman, Surrogate of the county of Burlington, do hereby certify that the within named Garret S. Canuon and Robert B. Aertsen hath entered into bond to the ordinary of the State of New Jersey, with Jeremiah C. Garthwaite, L. Mailliard, and Stephen Cubberly, sufficient security for the faithful performance of the trusts in the within assignment contained, according to the statute.

Dated April 10th, 1849. BENJ. BUCKMAN, *Surrogate.*

Recorded April 10th, A. D. 1849. JOSEPH F. BURR, *Cl'k.*

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, *Burlington County, ss.* } I, Joseph F. Burr, Clerk of the Inferior Court of Common Pleas of the county of Burlington, do hereby certify that the aforegoing is a true copy of the record of the Deed of Assignment between the parties named therein, as full and entire as the same remains of record in my office, in Book U 4 of Deeds, page 619, &c.

In testimony whereof, I have hereto set my hand and the seal of the said Court, this third day of July, A. D., eighteen hundred and forty-nine. [L. S.] JOSEPH F. BURR, *Cl'k.*